

## **REMARKS**

The Advisory Action of January 5, 2006, has been reviewed and considered by the Applicants. Claim 10 has been amended. Claims 6-10, 12-18, 20, 21, and 24-26 remain pending. Applicants request reconsideration of the Application.

In paragraphs 5-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner cited Yuh (US 6,177,219) in support for several 103(a) rejections to teach the use of a photogenerating pigment in a hole blocking layer. Because Applicants believe the use of this reference is incorrect in each of those rejections, Applicants traverse those rejections here.

In the prior response of December 15, 2005, Applicants argued that the use of Yuh was incorrect. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner rejected this argument on several grounds.

The Examiner stated that the instant claims did not recite a positively charged imaging member. Claim 10 has been amended to recite that the imaging member is positively charged.

The Examiner also stated that the instant claims do not recite that the photogenerating pigments comprise "p-type" particles, that the specification does not define the pigments as p-type particles, and that Applicants cannot argue patentability based on limitations not present in the claims. Applicants respectfully submit that it is the Examiner's burden to show that Yuh discloses the use of p-type particles in order to render the instant claims obvious. As previously discussed, Yuh only teaches the use of n-type particles. Therefore, Yuh would not render the instant blocking layer obvious.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claims 6-10, 12-16, 20, 21, 25, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over the combination of Yuh (6,177,219), Liu (6,277,535), and Kondo (4,424,267). Applicants traverse the rejection. Yuh is inapplicable to the hole blocking layer of the instant claims for the reason discussed above. The other references do not remedy the deficiency. As such, not all claim limitations are met. MPEP § 2143.03. Applicants request withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection.

In paragraph 6, claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over the combination of Yuh, Lin, Kondo, Knauf, and Hendrickson. Applicants

traverse the rejection. Any claim depending from a non-obvious claim is itself non-obvious. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*. Applicants request withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection.

In paragraph 7, claims 6-10, 12-18, 21, 25, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over the combination of Pai (5,316,880), Yuh, Lin, and Kondo. Applicants traverse the rejection. Yuh is inapplicable to the hole blocking layer of the instant claims for the reason discussed above. The other references do not remedy the deficiency. As such, not all claim limitations are met. MPEP § 2143.03. Applicants request withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection.

In paragraph 8, claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as reportedly being obvious over the combination of Pai, Yuh, Lin, Kondo, Knauf, and Hendrickson. Applicants traverse the rejection. As noted above, any claim depending from a non-obvious claim is itself non-obvious. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*. Applicants request withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection.


### CONCLUSION

For those reasons, all pending claims (6-10, 12-18, 20, 21, and 24-26) are believed to be in a condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Richard M. Klein, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,  
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

April 12, 2006  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard M. Klein (Reg. No. 33,000)  
1100 Superior Avenue, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579  
(216) 861-5582